

privileged to work with communities across the country to help make them more livable, nothing has captured the imagination of the ordinary citizen more strongly than suggesting that our communities no longer be held hostage to the whims of billionaire sports team owners. The fact today is that a few dozen of America's richest people can decide for any reason at all that they are not making enough money, or they think they could make more money, or that they do not like the color of the stadium, or that perhaps they could squeeze more from the fans where they are by offering up the possibility that their team will be relocated somewhere else, perhaps to a town that some other owner has abandoned.

The bidding war with threats, implied or explicit, for taxpayers and fans to cough up millions more in subsidies to a franchise is a fact of life for fans in more than half of America's metropolitan areas. It has been a sad spectacle that started in the 1950s when the profitable Brooklyn Dodgers and their compatriots, the New York Giants, both baseball teams, left for greener pastures in California. This has triggered a parade of franchise relocation, many times not because of a lack of fan support or financial support but simply because the owners felt they could get a better deal elsewhere. Witness the recent sad situation of the long-suffering fans in Cleveland, Ohio, who have been in that icebox of a stadium year in and year out to capacity and now the Browns are gone.

The sad fact is that the Federal Government aids and abets this relocation process. It grants an antitrust broadcast exemption that makes franchises worth hundreds of millions of dollars and makes the leagues possible and extraordinarily profitable. The NFL alone in the most recent round of contract negotiations netted \$17.5 billion.

Still there is no stability for the American fan, and they continue to pay more for tickets, more for parking, more for taxes, more for seat licenses, more for concessions that make it less affordable, less comfortable for the community and ever more lucrative for the few who profit.

It does not have to be this way. I have introduced the Give Fans a Chance Act which would require that leagues follow their stated rules on relocation and consider the community impact, actually involve the community in the decisionmaking process.

My legislation would give local communities the opportunity, after this analysis takes place, to actually match a bid for a franchise that might otherwise be relocated. And, most important, it would not allow these professional sports leagues to have artificial restraints on who can own a team.

The NFL, for example, has decreed there will be no more Green Bay Packers style community ownership. One has got to be a billionaire. Green Bay, Wisconsin, one thirty-fourth the size of Los Angeles, has one of the most suc-

cessful franchises in professional sports, and it is owned by 1,950 shareholders. Little Green Bay, Wisconsin, does not have to worry that when they invest millions of dollars in their facilities, that somehow an owner is going to decide to relocate elsewhere, and it has made a profound difference in that community.

The NFL and others argue that Green Bay is an aberration, a special case, that it cannot be replicated anywhere else, that people in other communities are not smart enough to figure this out. I disagree. I do not think Green Bay, as unique as that community is, is an aberration and a special case, and I think we ought to at least give other fans the same chance.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Give Fans a Chance legislation. I strongly urge long-suffering sports fans to lend their voice. If the American people are heard, truly we will give the sports fans a chance.

DECENNIAL CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of the upcoming decennial census which is just 13 months away. A year from next month, the forms will be going into the mail, tens of millions of them, all across America to count everyone. We need to do the best job we can, without politics, to get everyone counted.

Sadly, this administration has proposed a historic change. Because for every census since Thomas Jefferson in 1790, we have attempted to count everyone, but this administration has wanted to use polling techniques in order to say, "We don't need to count everyone. Let me just guesstimate at the numbers."

Fortunately last week the Supreme Court finally said, "No, you've got to count." The actual enumeration as stated in the Constitution is the law of the land. We need to count everyone for purposes of apportionment.

Sadly, this administration does not want to listen to the courts. They have got this idea now that they want to have a two-number census. What they are proposing is, we will have a set of numbers provided that the Supreme Court says are the legal numbers, and then the Clinton Administration wants to adjust these numbers and have a Clinton set of numbers. And so for every city and county in this great country we are going to have two sets of numbers, a Supreme Court set of numbers and the Clinton numbers.

We have enough cynicism and doubts in this country, and we need to have trust in our government. We do not need to create the confusion of two sets of numbers. The Census Bureau and the professionals at least in the past have argued against two sets of numbers. Hopefully they will stand by their prin-

ciples and say two sets of numbers are wrong, because we can only have one set of numbers. It is what is required by law and that is what the Supreme Court has ruled.

To do the census is difficult work. It is hard work. It costs a lot of money. Because we only do it once every 10 years, we need to concentrate all of our efforts into doing the best census possible. Because if we try to do two censuses, we are going to have two failed censuses, and that is wrong for America.

Can my colleagues just imagine every community having the choice of two numbers? This is a lawyer's dream. In fact, Justice Scalia at the oral arguments of the Supreme Court last November said, "Are we going to be creating a whole new area of census law?" That is exactly what could happen with a two-number census.

What we need to do, as I proposed last week to the Conference of Mayors, is a proposal to put all the resources we can and all the actions that this Congress can provide to get the best census possible. Everybody should be counted. I have proposed a series of provisions, from increasing the amount of paid advertising from \$100 million to \$400 million, from the idea that we will need another 100,000 more enumerators to get the job done right.

Yes, we are proposing to increase the spending on the census in order to get the best census possible that is trusted by the American people. Why not use AmeriCorps? I have doubts that we need AmeriCorps, but a Republican advocating using AmeriCorps for the census I think is rather significant.

Something else that we are proposing is something called the post-census local review. I think almost every mayor and county commissioner in this country will support this. It was used in the 1990 census. What it is is that after the Census Bureau gets their numbers, they are sent back to the local communities to evaluate, to in effect conduct an audit and to see if there is something missing. If there is, they can raise the issue with the Census Bureau and then the Census Bureau will adjust the numbers if those challenges and questions are correctly adjusted.

Why not, to build trust in our census, allow communities a chance to review the numbers before they become official? What are the Census Bureau and the administration afraid of, trusting our local officials like we did in 1990 to have a chance to review it before it becomes official?

I also propose that we work together with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) on legislation to make it available, for example, that welfare workers or retired officers have the right without losing their benefits to work temporarily for the Census Bureau. We want to get local people involved in the Census.

I have held hearings of the Subcommittee on Census in Miami, and

most recently in Phoenix where we met with American Indians, getting the input and ideas of how do we address the issue. What we have found out over and over is we need local people involved in the process. We need local advertising that targets the local community as best we can.

We can conduct a good census and get the best census ever. But if we are going to play games with this administration and say we are going to have two censuses, which is illegal, we are going to waste our efforts and have two failed censuses. Let us work together and get the best census possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHITHER THE BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I spoke on this floor in reference to the many, many promises the President made in his State of the Union speech and in the days just before and just after that speech. As Senator Everett Dirksen said many years ago, "A billion here and a billion there and pretty soon it adds up to some real money." It is probably the easiest thing in the world to spend other people's money.

It is also one of the easiest things in the world to promise government money for everything to everybody. Yet as the National Taxpayers Union pointed out after the State of the Union speech, the promises contained therein would require \$288.4 billion in

increased spending in the first year alone. The next week, last week, Newsweek magazine published a chart showing that all these new promises would, if enacted, cause a \$2.3 trillion shortfall over the next 15 years.

On election day of 1994 when control of the Congress changed parties, the stock market, the Dow Jones average, was at 3800. It has now reached as high as 9600. One of the main reasons our economy has been so strong over these last 4 or 4½ years has been that we finally started bringing Federal spending under control. We are even, temporarily at least, having some surpluses.

But let me point out how big a change this is. A few months after President Clinton took office, Alice Rivlin, his Director of the Office of Management and Budget, put out a shocking memo. She said that if we did not make major changes in spending, we would have yearly deficits of over \$1 trillion a year by the year 2010 and between \$4 and \$5 trillion a year by the year 2030.

If we had allowed that to happen, our entire economy would have crashed. No one would have been able to buy a car or a home. Our children of today would have seen their standard of living not even probably 5 or 10 percent of what it is when they are in the prime of their lives, if we had sat around and let the ridiculous and wasteful Federal spending that was going on continue.

□ 1300

Sometimes it is far more compassionate to not spend money and instead leave more money with the families of America to spend on their children as they see fit. Today taxes and government spending are at all-time highs. There is a misimpression by some that government spending has been cut in recent years. Really all we have done is slow down the great increases that were going on.

When I first came to the Congress, every department or agency was routinely receiving 12 and 15 and 18, even 20 percent increases in spending each year. Everyone knew that we could not continue spending at that rate, everyone knew that that would lead very soon to a major crash of our economy, and so we were able to get things under a little better control and decrease or cut these increases in spending down to about 3 percent a year, something that we have been able to live with.

But today the average person, the average family, spends about 40 percent of his or her income in taxes and at least another 10 percent in government regulatory costs. A Member of the other body, Senator FRED THOMPSON from my State of Tennessee, ran some ads a couple of years ago which were so true. He said today one spouse works to support the government while the other spouse works to support the family. This is why we are talking about tax cuts.

But if we allow all these promises and programs that have been made in

recent weeks to be enacted, we will get back into trouble so quick it will make your head swim. We will get back just where we were a few years ago. We will not see these surpluses that are predicted for the years ahead. To enact bills that allow, as Newsweek said, a shortfall of \$2.3 trillion over the next 15 years would just be unconscionable.

And I want to place in the RECORD at this point a column on the State of the Union speech written by nationally syndicated columnist Charley Reese, which I think sums up far better than I have the situation that we will get back into if we are not careful:

[From the Orlando Sentinel, Jan. 28, 1999]

DON'T BUY INTO LIES ON TOP OF LIES ABOUT A NONEXISTENT SURPLUS

(By Charley Reese)

The first thing to keep in mind when evaluating Bill Clinton's laundry list of promises, made in his state of the Union speech, is that Mr. Clinton is a proven liar.

As any misled wife can tell you, the practical problem in dealing with a liar is deciding when, if ever, he is telling the truth and when he is lying. Lying is far more serious than liars would have you believe.

Two main lies underlie his speech.

One is the lie that Social Security needs saving. Well, only from politicians. The current tax brings in more than enough money to keep the Social Security Trust Fund solvent, but Congress and presidents use the surplus to offset deficits in other places in order to promulgate the second lie—that the budget has a surplus.

Both Republicans and Democrats are co-conspirators in this con job.

So, starting with two lies, Clinton then proceeds to spend a nonexistent surplus stretching 15 years into the future. Even if this year's surplus were real, there is no way to predict that the surpluses will continue for 15 years into the future. That is pure fantasy.

Clinton's promising this and promising that, all financed by a nonexistent future surplus, is a perfect example of demagoguery. Furthermore, everything Clinton proposed, except spending more on defense (again with the mythical surplus money), is unconstitutional.

Yes, I know that nobody pays any attention to the Constitution except lawyers trying to get around the democratic process. But, nevertheless, if you will just read the document, you will notice that nowhere is the federal government authorized to get involved in local land planning, health care (long- or short-term), child care, urban sprawl, education or discouraging kids from smoking tobacco. (God knows they've done a poor job of discouraging them from smoking dope).

It's dismaying that more people can't see through this thinly disguised con game Washington politicians are playing. They do polls. They find out what folks are worrying about. They promise to fix it. They pretend they can fix it, despite a deplorable record of failure (\$5 trillion and the feds lost the War on Poverty; \$40 billion and they lost the war on drugs). They pretend they can do it at no cost. This year, they will all be spending the mythical surpluses, which, like psychics, they know will come in the future.

All this amounts to is blatant vote-buying, as corrupt as if they were standing outside the voting booths, stuffing \$20 bills into people's pockets. It amounts to robbing Jane to buy the vote of Betsy.

Why should one working mother, who pays for her own child care, be taxed to provide free child care to someone else?